



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCC.

MARCH, 1890.

FREE TRADE OR PROTECTION.

A CONTINUATION OF THE GLADSTONE-BLAINE CONTROVERSY.

BY THE HON. JUSTIN S. MORRILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR
FROM VERMONT.

APOLOGY FOR THIS ARTICLE.

ANY extended argument of the Right Honorable W. E. Gladstone must always afford ample evidence of great ability, as well as wealth of learning, and it would have been presumption on my part to accept the invitation to reply to his recent article in *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* on "Free Trade or Protection," if it were not that "Protection," the easy side of the question, had been allotted to me. It was a further encouragement when I found, upon examining in detail Mr. Gladstone's free-trade argumentation, that I could sincerely reciprocate some of his own words, and say, While we listen to a melody presented to us as new, the idea gradually arises in the mind, "I have heard this before," and it has been heard by me so often from our Democratic revenue-reform friends that the refrain, if not a bore, excites neither delight nor alarm.

Remembering, as I do, the masterly speech of Mr. Gladstone when, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, he opened the debate on the budget of 1853, and also his later eloquent series of remarkable speeches for three days in the Midlothian campaign, I can have no feeling but that of the highest respect for one who must be regarded as the foremost living statesman of our mother-country. For this discussion he appears to have formulated a

rule, after the manner of the Marquis of Queensberry, which I cannot refuse to accept, that "in the arena of discussion" one must take his chance as "a common combatant, entitled to free speech and to fair treatment, but to nothing more."

It is my purpose to controvert some share of the free-trade assertions directly, but for the most part by the general scope of my reply, as to copy at length all of the statements to be refuted, and to follow each with a special reply, would cover too much space. Happily, Mr. Gladstone does not sweeten free trade by another name and conceal it by what, in America, has been styled its "*varioloid*," *revenue reform*.

Mr. Gladstone appears to have had the subject of "Free Trade or Protection" on the anvil ever since he was challenged to its discussion by Mr. McKay pending the Presidential election of 1888. He admits the victory of protection in that election, but strives to convince Americans of their folly. His great ability as an instructor may be admitted, and his teachings in Great Britain, where he has had experience, are deservedly of the highest authority; but in America, where we all regret that he has never set his foot, they are as unworthy of practical application and as much out of place as British laws for the regulation of the government of India would be if applied to the Dominion of Canada.

THE LOGIC OF FACTS.

It will be claimed by me that the logic of facts and results is more worthy of acceptance than any theory, however plausible it may seem to be, and that by this test American protection has long been triumphant; not arguing that an excess of protection would be beneficial, but in favor of such moderate and healthful discrimination as will protect American industries, from their birth to maturity, against destruction by foreign competition.

Protectionists deny that there is any possible scientific system of tariff upon foreign imports which merits and requires universal application. It is a question of practical experience alone as to what may be best at the time for each and every independent nation, to be most intelligently determined by its own legislative authority.

Mr. Gladstone assumes, in substance, as Free-Traders generally assume, that free trade, or the let-alone revenue system, which was started in 1846 with the repeal of the Corn Laws, and practically adopted by Great Britain less than thirty

years ago, is based on scientific truth, natural law, and moral virtue, applicable to all nations and to all times alike, and that any other system is not only false, but wasteful and unchristian. This overlauded economical discovery appears to have been unknown to Bacon and Locke, Newton and Paley, unregarded by a great majority of enlightened Christian nations, and especially unregarded by the British colonies. And yet it seems almost a personal grief to Mr. Gladstone that the United States should be unwilling to accept the beatitudes of free trade, although British interests, as he claims, have prospered, and will prosper, in spite of American adherence to protection. Why not, then, let us alone ?

If the whole world were one vast Utopia of communistic brethren, and swords were to be beaten into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks, free trade might be the accepted gospel of all international intercourse, and the glories of patriotism shunned as a reproach ; but the world is a conglomerate of different races of men, having discordant ambitions, higher and lower conditions of civilization and wealth, many religious creeds, unequal physical and mental vigor, and aptitudes and habits as diverse as color and climate. The idea that there is any economical principle, whether of science, nature, or morals, which should be left to its own course, and that nothing should be done by any people through legislation to change or to elevate and increase their industrial power, is the fetich of British Free-Traders. As well might all social virtues be left unprotected and without legislation. As well leave all individuals without the help of education as to leave the nation without such help. It is nothing less than the old fallacy, "Shoot without taking aim, and you will be sure to hit the mark." Can any friend of Ireland, for instance, after years of close contact with a great free-trade kingdom, and with two-thirds of its productive area abandoned to permanent pasture, believe that the free-trade policy has been best for Ireland ? The sublime virtue of having no prejudices in favor of their own country does not seem to have taken root in that part of the United Kingdom.

UNDERPAID BRITISH LABOR BENEFITED BY AMERICAN PROTECTION.

Mr. Gladstone claims that other nations, and above all others the United States, have derived immense benefits through British free-trade legislation. If this should be admitted, as it need not

be, why, then, should the United States wish to revolutionize and change its position by a change of its revenue policy? But, he says, "We [Great Britain] have not on this ground any merits or any claims whatever. We legislated for our own benefit and are satisfied with the benefits we have received." Other nations are also satisfied that have legislated for their own benefit, though adversely to free trade, as, with the exception of the Britannic Isle, the whole of Europe and America now adheres to the doctrine of protection. The people of every nation must be allowed to comprehend best what will be for their own benefit, notwithstanding the gracious efforts of British statesmen to promulgate their precepts and expound their virtuous example. Few outside of Great Britain will care to dispute that free trade may now be her wisest policy, and perhaps a paramount necessity; nor will any one doubt, were it otherwise, that the policy of free trade, in spite of the moral sublimity now claimed for it, would be swiftly changed, whether the Tory or the Liberal party were in power. British wealth, however, was founded upon the most stubborn measures of protection that the world has ever known, which were only discontinued after they had accomplished their chief and greatest work,—the general perfection and supremacy of their manufactures,—as protection, with an enterprising people, is designed to accomplish. Protection was no longer needed, but cheap bread and cheap wages were the British problem to be solved by free trade.

Great Britain formerly not only exacted heavy protective duties from merchandise imported into her home territories, but she pitilessly monopolized both the export and import trade of her numerous colonies,—drawing sustenance from the bosoms of her own daughters,—from which the fortunes and titles of many great families were created and the mercantile power of the kingdom established. These colonies are now far more prosperous under their own protective policy, but the mother-country continues to be largely their creditor, and still profits by a large share of their trade.

After nearly 400 years of the most unexampled protection, Great Britain acquired the command of capital, machinery, steam power, and of long-trained labor, including even that of children, by which to compete successfully in the chief markets for the trade of the world. Her labor during the long season of protec-

tion, though never sinking to the level of the Continent, had long been underpaid, by direct act of Parliament until 1813, and underpaid to this day by class domination. It may be true that the wages of British workmen have advanced in the progress of the age even under the system of free trade, not *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, but because their best workmen have had a whip in their own hands, and for \$20 have had the power in one week to transplant themselves to America, where they could be better fed, better clothed, better educated, and better housed, or where, with fewer hours of labor, they could add from 50 to 100 per cent. to their wages. American competition has thus compelled an increase of free-trade wages, which must be conceded, or their best men would desert the manufacturers, and the latter, it should be confessed, do not seem to be grateful to the American promoters of such good works.

It follows that the British workmen have derived and still derive an immense benefit from the system of American protection. We claim no merit for this because we also "have legislated for our own benefit and are satisfied with the benefits we have received." The number of British immigrants to the United States, for the year ending December 31, 1888, was 171,141, more being from England than from any other part of the kingdom, and a large proportion being mechanics and skilled workmen. This does not include the many thousands arriving through the back door of Canada, of whom no account is made. This ceaseless flow of British immigrants supplies a multitude of potential reasons why wages in England "have become both generally and absolutely higher, and greatly higher, under free trade." Mr. McKay may not have been entirely accurate as to the wages paid in Wigan, though there is unlimited proof on the general subject of the great disparity of British wages when compared with American; but the living testimony of these thousands of British immigrants is an incontestable support of the American contention of protection against all theories.

Workmen in Great Britain, when out of employment, are said to have no resource but the workhouse, but American workmen generally own their own houses, take their own newspapers, and have money in savings-banks. The increase in wages under protection enormously increases the power of consumption by wage-

earners and by their families, while free trade only increases the luxuries of the rich, and the common people find them beyond their reach.

Slavery in America, not caring for the wages of labor, long wedded many Southern States to free trade, but, having parted from slavery, they are now fast finding reasons for a divorce from free trade.

Free trade does not even profess regard for the wages of artisans, and is based wholly on the idea of supplying the demands of the consumer at the lowest cost. How the armies which delve in mines and work in mills and factories are fed and housed, educated and paid, does not concern the "dismal science" of Free-Traders—if only they can be cheaply paid. They start in the race by challenging the competition of the lowest-paid laborers of all the world. That wages under free trade, in such a race, can be equal to wages under protection is glaringly preposterous.

Mr. Gladstone asserts that "in your protected trades profits are hard pressed by wages." The fair inference is—reversing the proposition—that profits of capital are not hard pressed by wages under free trade. In other words, wages must be hard pressed by free trade, and this is painfully exhibited by the present abounding strikes of British workmen.

Mr. Gladstone gives Mr. Giffen as authority on British wages, and claims that from 1833 to 1883 the wages paid on, exportable manufactures of Bradford and Huddersfield have advanced 20 and 30 per cent. Why go back so far when the complete enjoyment of free trade is only claimed for less than thirty years? It would possibly be more fair to assume that much of the advance claimed may have occurred long before the era of free trade. In America we go back no further than 1860 to claim an advance of more than double the amount specified in the wages of laborers, both in factories and on farms. But, as Mr. Gladstone does not insist that wages are not higher in America under protection than in Great Britain under free trade, it would seem superfluous to offer statistical proofs of the wide difference known to exist, and with which the public on both sides of the Atlantic are not altogether unfamiliar. One fresh illustration of the difference, however, may not be inopportune. The late great wage-strike of the London dockmen was made to obtain an increase of one penny per hour,—6d. (12 cents), instead of 5d. (10 cents), per hour,—

and the increase of one penny per hour has been reckoned as a crowning victory. But the 'longshoremen, employed in the same kind of work on the docks of New York, are paid 30 cents an hour for day, and 40 cents an hour for night, work. Twelve cents an hour was stoutly resisted in free-trade London, while 250-per cent. higher wages still prevail under protection in New York.

PROTECTION PUTS THE CHIEF BURDEN ON THE FOREIGNER.

Protectionists claim, as Bismarck claims, that protection puts the chief burden upon the foreigner, who is compelled to pay the duty or give an equivalent by reducing the price of his products. They also claim that, in the long run, the consumers supply their wants at less cost than would be possible without protected home competition. For example, years ago moquette carpets brought \$5 to \$6 per yard, but under protection, and owing to a loom invented by an American, they are now sold at \$1.50 per yard and sometimes for less. Bessemer steel rails in 1867 brought \$166 per ton, but with a protective duty the price in 1885 was only \$28.50 per ton, and \$27.50 in 1888. From 1867 to 1888 there were made in the United States 15,803,011 tons of steel rails, and 1,256,857 tons were imported. This new industry gives employment to many thousands of people, and presents only a single example of many showing the creation, as well as the increase, of the wage fund by protection. American railroads unquestionably obtained their steel rails in the aggregate at far less cost than would have been possible even with free rails and dependence upon foreign supply and foreign prices. When the American demand in 1872 exceeded the home supply, the British price at once was advanced from 230 shillings per ton to 350 shillings, and again in 1880 the British price was for the same reason advanced from 170 shillings per ton to 200. This shows how merciless would be the greed of foreigners were our manufactures suspended for lack of protection.

HOME MANUFACTURES SAVE MUCH OF THE COST OF TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION.

Home manufactures planted in every State alongside of the farmer largely save in distribution the heavy cost and waste of long transportation. Foreign merchandise landed at some seaport must be distributed at great expense across the whole country, and exports of grain must be freighted from the remotest interior States to seaports and then across the Atlantic. Both of

these outlays are either wholly avoided or greatly reduced by the presence of home manufactures, which are sold (their value being well known) by the wholesale, as well as the retail, dealer for a much smaller commission than are foreign goods, of the cost and merit of which the public are ignorant.

The immediate proximity to farmers of manufactures is an advantage so great that the holdings of farmers, in every locality of America where such proximity exists, can readily be sold for more than 50 per cent. above the price of land where manufactures have not been established, and annually yield a much larger income.

Americans prefer to make a home market for all of their agricultural products, and not to depend upon uncertain and elusive foreign markets. Every ship-load of wheat or corn exported not only impoverishes the fertility of the land whence it was taken, but tends to reduce both the price abroad and at home. Free trade in America would cripple, perhaps ruin, both agriculture and manufactures, and protection is accorded to both; for here it is applied to both, and tends not only to shield them from harm, but has operated to increase the wages of agricultural labor equally with the wages of employees in manufactures,—which shows that any pretence about unprotected labor is wholly false and intended by American Free-Traders only to deceive.

We have no class legislation, and protection protects one-half of the population no more than the other; wool as well as cloth. All of our people are now free to labor where they choose, where they can earn the most and receive the highest reward; and the man who to-day works on the farm may to-morrow, if he pleases, find employment in the mine, mill, or factory, and obtain the customary wages awarded to like skill and service.

PROTECTION PRODUCES THE BEST WORK.

Protection turns out not merely good work, but the best. Local competition always pushes the best to the front. American locomotives are received in Australia, New Zealand, South America, and elsewhere, as equal to any in the world, and as cheap. Some British manufacturers and traders stamp their cotton goods with American trade-marks because similar American goods, wherever known, fetch the highest price. House-furnishing and saddlery hardware, locks, joiners' tools, watches, silverware, jewelry, paper of all kinds, and many other articles of American

manufacture are often both superior to and cheaper than similar articles produced abroad. Our agricultural implements are recognized everywhere as the best inventions of the age. American sewing-machines and carriages easily take the lead of foreign fashions and foreign makes. When Mr. Gladstone presented to his forester an axe, he did not seek for one of English make, but found the best and presented one of American make.

Mr. Gladstone declares that under high duties they had the "worst corks in Europe." This was deplorable, but if they had only adopted the American remedy of the Maine law, they would not even have had

"To stop for one bad cork the butler's pay,"

as the demand for corks would suddenly have been estopped. On our part, it is remembered that, prior to the development of home manufactures, America was forced to accept such sorry foreign goods as were offered, and here was the great dumping-place for inferior and Brummagem articles, which, like Pindar's razors, were "made only to sell." Protection has brought relief from such imposition

Mr. Gladstone would be humorous, and endeavors to plunge the advocates of protection into the mire of a *reductio ad absurdum* by saying :

"If the proper object for the legislator is to keep and employ in his country the greatest possible amount of capital, then the British Parliament (*exempli gratiâ*) ought to protect not only wheat, but pineapples."

This tropical illustration, though dimmed by age and long service, shows that Free-Traders claim not only a monopoly of trade, but of common-sense. The pineapple argument may be dismissed as too far-fetched.

But Mr. Gladstone appears fond of extremes and pursues the subject by adding the following :

"If protection be, as its champions (or victims) hold, in itself an economical good, then it holds in the sphere of production the same place as belongs to truth in the sphere of philosophy, or to virtue in the sphere of morals. In this case, you cannot have too much of it; so that, while mere protection is economical good in embryo, such good finds its full development only in the prohibition of foreign trade "

It may be observed, "in the sphere of philosophy," that in the case of fire, water, and air, though all are useful servants, no one would say of either, "You cannot have too much of it." The supporters of American protection, on their guard against all

suicidal extremes, propose to reduce, as they have reduced protective legislation, wherever and whenever the prosperity of their countrymen requires it, and are in no danger of being burned or drowned by protection, though they cannot escape an occasional gust of free trade from the trade-winds across the Atlantic.

Evidently Mr. Gladstone would enforce the reverse of his proposition, or that "you cannot have too much of" free trade; doubtless feeling that other nations cannot have too much of it to suit Great Britain. If free trade is one of the moral virtues, however, as seems to be claimed, is it not rather reckless, "in the sphere of morals," to disregard the wisdom of classic ages handed down by the axiom, *In medio tutissimus ibis*? In their hard-pressed corn, iron, cotton, and silk industries, are there not many Englishmen ready to say of free trade, "Good Lord, deliver us!"?

FREE TRADE AMONG THE STATES.

Certainly Mr. Gladstone has a fondness for the logic of extreme cases, and he asks, in relation to the greater profit in keeping labor and capital at home, this question:

"But if this really is so, if there be this inborn fertility in the principle itself, why are the several States of the Union precluded from applying it within their own respective borders?"

If this were asked with the expectation of serious consideration, it might be answered that local tariffs between the States would not only be inexpedient, but impossible to enforce, and they are properly superseded by the far better protection afforded by the general government. As a nation, we are one great family, or, as he calls us, "a world, and not a very little world," where each one of the members contributes to the general welfare, where free trade has a special and exceptional domain for its proper development, and where its results are beneficent. As dependencies of Great Britain, we were annually robbed and had no protection, and therefore declared our independence. It was a great point through the union then established to escape local State tariffs, and national protection was secured in our very earliest legislative acts.

It may not be impertinent now to offer a Roland for an Oliver, and to inquire, if there be inborn fertility in the principle of free trade, why it is not beneficently applied to the several large and populous colonies of Great Britain by the omnipotence of the

British Parliament. Surely a measure of this transcendent importance, which keeps her legislators constantly awake looking with anxious pity after the fiscal and moral interests of the United States, should not permit them to sleep when it equally concerns (to borrow Mr. Gladstone's phrases) the *waste, robbery, and imposition* that are so rampant in British colonies and dependencies—embracing one-seventh of the land surface of the globe and nearly one-fourth of its population. “Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?” Is it possible that Mr. Gladstone should have been unmindful of these great possessions—virgin fields for the planting of unadulterated free trade—when he penned the following eloquent sentence?—

“There opens before the thinking mind when this supreme question is propounded a vista so transcending all ordinary limitation as requires an almost preterhuman force and expansion of the mental eye in order to embrace it.”

America won the battle for the colonists in 1776, when they were not suffered by Great Britain to work in the more refined manufactures even for their own consumption. The erection of steel furnaces and slitmills in any of her American plantations was prohibited. The exportation from one province to another by water, or even the carriage by land upon horseback or in a cart, of hats, wool, and woollen goods of the produce of America, was also wholly prohibited. We have changed all that.

PRIMACY.

Mr. Gladstone is pleased to say

“that in international transactions the British nation for the present enjoys a commercial primacy; that no country in the world shows any capacity to wrest it from us, except it be America; that, if America shall frankly adopt and steadily maintain a system of free trade, she will by degrees, perhaps not slow degrees, outstrip us in the race, and will probably take the place which at present belongs to us; but that she will not injure us by the operation.”

When all the great markets of the world are drying up as to imports of manufactures, and are being supplied by their own home products, how is it possible that the United States would not, as a rival, injure British trade by coming to the front and taking the place and primacy which at present belong to Great Britain? Their government is making ambitious efforts in every quarter of the globe to obtain an increase of its foreign trade, and, if that is now diminishing, or insufficient for one, how can it be enough for two, or for both England and America?

Of course Mr. Gladstone is sincere. He is among the first, if not the foremost, of loyal Englishmen, and could not be induced to advocate any measure that would not benefit his own country. He sees that free trade with America would offer a prodigious market for British manufactures, and that absorbing advantage hides everything beyond. But it will not be forgotten that the leaders of Great Britain, he proudly eminent among them,* not very long since were quite willing that such primacy as we then alone enjoyed on the American continent should be nullified and overthrown, and for their unlawful aid in that direction made an atonement of \$15,000,000.

But Mr. Gladstone plainly and bluntly builds all of his castles-in-the-air relating to our primacy upon our producing more wheat, corn, cotton, and mineral oils for foreign export, and says that we should not invest "in mills or factories to produce yarn or cloth which we could obtain more cheaply from abroad." It follows that he would have the primacy wholly restricted to agricultural exports, and is oblivious of the fact—while his own country furnishes a very limited and about the only foreign market—that our present exports of these products operate adversely upon our agricultural interests, and that the policy of American protection is vigorously maintained in order to create a larger body of consumers at home and to give to agriculture higher rewards. Why should not America have its own home market? Surely nature is not against it, morality is not against it, and if free-trade science is against it, so much the worse for the science. We must make the market we do not and cannot elsewhere find. We have found that often less has been obtained for a very large export of cotton than for a medium or smaller one, showing that an excessive crop pays the least profit. Some of our Western States have also found the largest crop of corn most valuable as their cheapest fuel, and the wheat crop in some of our territories, like that of the apple elsewhere, when very large, pays little more than for the harvesting.

Beyond this, Russia, Egypt, India, and other countries leave us to supply only a pitiful share of any deficiency of European

* Mr. Gladstone was a Southern sympathizer, and in the Roebuck debate on the recognition of the Southern Confederacy said: "It is not, therefore, from indifference—it is not any adequate or worthy object on the part of the North—that I would venture to deprecate in the strongest terms the adoption of the motion of the honorable and learned gentleman."

food crops, and that at the minimum prices. South America, and our great American desert, improved by irrigation, may also soon prove the marvels of the age in the production of food crops. An increase of the supply from any quarter would instantly depress foreign prices, leaving for American exports losses instead of profits; and our farming interests, with increased crops and without an increase of consumers, would sink to the level of those now so greatly depressed in Great Britain. Again, if, as suggested, we were no longer to protect and support home manufactures, or investments in "mills and factories," but put our home market of 95 per cent. in limbo, or the paradise of fools, in order to increase the 5 per cent. (not including cotton) which we occasionally have of such exports, how long would it be before the prices of the products of foreign "mills and factories" would mount far above the present current rates in America? Our manufactures, outside of household industries, amounted in 1880 to \$5,369,579,191, and it is estimated will reach \$7,000,000,000 in 1890. Were we to surrender this unmatched field to free trade, the immense capital invested must be largely sacrificed, and thousands of laborers turned adrift, "the world all before them where to choose." Europeans, with their

"discontent
Made glorious summer,"

would rush to fill the void with their products, upon their own terms, and for them a new world would have been discovered by free trade.

Purchasers of home products are sure to retain capital for the wage fund of laborers in their own country and keep it in circulation; but when purchases are made abroad, the capital goes to a bourn whence it never returns.

The increment of capital employed in British manufactures is apparently becoming unsatisfactory and doubtful. If this were not so, why are there so many millions of British capital at the present moment fleeing from their free-trade home and running to and fro in America as supplicants for any random employment? Evidently the wage fund for English workmen would appear to be unstable and on the wing.

As to the charge of waste in practical protection, it would be equally just to charge the blessings of the falling rain and the heat of the summer sun with undue waste. It will be sufficient

for an American to point to the fact that the United States since 1860, notwithstanding the boundless losses of both North and South in the late war, has much more than doubled its wealth and population, and since 1865 has reduced its public debt by the large sum of \$1,693,426,676, so that our yearly interest charge *per capita* was in 1888 only 63 cents, while that of Great Britain was \$3.75 *per capita*, or nearly six times as much. When any equal prosperity shall be visible among the people of Great Britain, it may be proper to meditate on the felicities of free trade. In this debt-paying race for the primacy, the British are just now only in sight, and Americans are not hard pressed by any rivals.

Free trade miserably fails to offer remunerative employment or any vitality to the forces of the great mass of the people, and the waste of latent power is enormous. The division of the British population according to occupation, as set forth in their own statistical publications of 1889, was :

Agricultural and industrial.....	10,818,206
Indefinite, unoccupied, and non-productive.....	19,703,745

Is not free trade responsible for this extraordinary excess of the non-productive population? These plethoric millions of mere drones surely cannot all be justly charged to the aristocracy.

THE HINDER PARTS OF BRITISH FREE TRADE.

It will be proper to inquire, What is the practical system of British free trade, which Americans are so urgently pressed by British statesmen, and by others who are not statesmen, to adopt? It may have worked well or ill for Great Britain; but what is there about it that should lead Americans to renounce the legislative precedents and the wisdom of their fathers, and to abandon the highway of their past and present matchless prosperity in order to follow a later-born experiment of our foremost rival in commerce and manufactures? "I fear the Greeks even when they bring gifts."

To answer the question, we are limited to a survey of the solitary British example, for no other nation treats free trade as anything better than a delusion and a snare. Free trade opens in Great Britain by levying a tariff duty on imported manufactured tobacco of 84 cents to 92 cents per pound; on unmanufactured tobacco, 104 to 116 cents per pound; on cigars, \$1.32 per pound;

on tea, 12 cents per pound ; on coffee, 3 cents per pound—if ground or prepared, 4 cents per pound ; on cocoa, raw, 2 cents per pound—if manufactured, 4 cents per pound. Among other items subject to duty are currants, figs, raisins, plums, prunes, soap, pickles, varnish, wine, gin, and all other spirits. These duties, it will be observed, bear heavily upon laboring people, who consume not less than 90 per cent. of the articles from which the largest part of British tariff revenue is obtained. The so-called revenue duty on tobacco, supplied from America, amounts to at least 1,500 per cent. The duty on tea and coffee is the same upon the lowest grade as upon the highest and choicest varieties. The free-trade idea is to place duties on articles not produced at home, instead of on such as are or ought to be produced there, and is the reverse of the American idea.

But this model free-trade tariff failed to yield (in 1888) more than \$98,150,000 of revenue, being only a little more than one-quarter part of the sum (\$378,300,000) required for the ordinary support of the British Government, and our British friends are compelled annually to exhaust all the resources of extreme taxation to cover the enormous deficiency of thrice as much more.

This dismal but inexorable sequence of the free-trade system has been in America studiously kept out of sight, where it forever should be, except in the emergency of a great war, and it will be enough now to catalogue its many sore titles. Supplemental to British free trade, and inseparable from it, will be found the following : A land and house tax, paid by occupiers as well as by owners ; a tax on legacies and successions ; a stamp tax on bills of exchange, receipts, and patents ; a tax on carriages, horses, man-servants, guns, and dogs ; an excise on gin and all other spirits ; and a tax on incomes. The woes of our rebellion gave us all the experience in this sad line of taxation we shall ever covet. Only a nation struggling to preserve its existence, or to protect its people from famine and sudden death, would be willing to tolerate so many Briarean arms clutching at the pockets of the people.

This onerous system of taxation is made necessary by free trade, and by the ponderous British public debt. The public debt of the United States, less cash in the treasury, is \$1,063,004,894, while in 1888 the debt of Great Britain, with about half as much population, was £705,575,073, or \$3,527,875,365—almost three and a half times that of the United States.

Revenue for the support of government must be had, but the British system presents its revolutionary odium, and Americans have lost nothing of their ancient repugnance for stamp and excise taxes. The United States, however, is paying off its public debt upon the canter, and raises its revenue by duties on imports, scarcely felt by taxpayers, but which are a great encouragement to home industries, and so levied that the foreign producer must pay for his entrance to our market. Peddlers are made to pay a license to sell their "truck" by each and every State; and why should not the foreigner, exempt from all local taxes, who seeks to sell his products not merely in one State, but throughout the whole Union, be required to pay for the privilege?

Great Britain has an annual deficiency of food products, and it seems necessary to obtain a foreign supply for more than one-half of her people. Without the command of the sea for transportation this supply might be cut off; and, to obtain means of purchasing it, it is also necessary to export manufactures and undersell all competitors in foreign markets, or her people must go without their daily food.

Free trade appeared to flourish until it encountered too many protective tariffs of other nations, now universal, and unlikely to be abolished. They are Gibraltars that everywhere frown upon those who are plotting to supersede and destroy the home industries of other people. British Free-Traders have found it hard to kick against such pricks, and now beg the help of America.

"No other country," Mr. Gladstone says of America, "has the same free choice of industrial pursuits, the same option to lay hold not on the good merely, but on the best." And yet this free choice, which gives to our people the control of all their natural forces, he would now limit, and give no option of mills and factories. America does not thrust its industrial theories upon Great Britain, and will be happy whether protection or free trade shall prevail there. The large subsidies that are paid to British ships for carrying foreign mails far transcend what that service might be obtained for if free trade were allowed with foreign competitors, and the annual sums also paid to large and fast-going steamers, to be utilized first for trade and second for war purposes when needed, furnish examples in the highest fields of protection; and we only lament and criticise our own shortcomings in the same service.

MORE CHAPTERS OF GLORY THAN OF SHAME.

Notwithstanding our ancient family difficulties, Great Britain must be credited with more chapters of glory than of shame, and America is now more firmly and tenderly attached to her people than to those of any other nation, and should be claimed as their best and most powerful friend, more especially since Great Britain seems to be step by step Americanized by the extension of the right of suffrage. Still we are now asked, in substance, to plod contentedly with hand labor, to raise corn and pasture herds, to dismiss our artisans, and forego machinery and all the forces of steam-engines, without which no nation, either in peace or war, can hope to be great or even independent. The selfishness of those who merely seek an extension of British trade may ask for this, but not those who more prize American power and American fraternity. In Europe, Great Britain, if not misrepresented, has no allies, and, among all first-class powers, not one earnest friend. Would it not be a blunder for even British Free-Traders to promote our acceptance of a policy that would be sure to reduce the United States to the rank of a second-rate power ?

Mr. Gladstone bestows lofty praise upon the unrivalled strength of our country by an eloquent recital of the American advantages over all nations, of our immense territory where there is nothing that the soil would refuse to yield, the rare excellence of the climate, the vast extent of coal and other mineral resources, the inventive faculty of the people surpassing all the world, and sums up as follows :

“I suppose there is no other country of the whole earth in which, if we combine together the surface and that which is below the surface, Nature has been so bountiful to man. The mineral resources of our Britannic Isle have, without question, principally contributed to its commercial preëminence. But when we match them with those of America, it is Lilliput against Brobdingnag.”

Yet in the face of all this, with a continent instead of an island, with twice the population of Great Britain, and with more of the natural aptitudes for the widest fields of manufactures than can be claimed even for the people from whom we sprang, Mr. Gladstone would place “the most inventive nation in the world” in subservience to British free trade, and confine the American people to the production of cotton, corn, meats, and mineral oils, and have them abandon more millions of manufactures than are annually produced by Great Britain herself, and sink all ambitions

for the protection of any products "we could obtain more cheaply from abroad." The anti-climax of the argument is rather conspicuous, and the American people will be in no mood to trail with a "broken wing" their ambition in the dust, and will surrender neither their manhood nor the bountiful gifts of nature.

MORAL ASPECTS OF FREE TRADE.

After all the economical arguments against protection appear to have been concluded, but not without some misgivings as to their efficiency, Mr. Gladstone summons to his aid for the final assault all the terrors of denunciation. He cannot finish what he calls his "indictment against protection" until he has anathematized it as "morally as well as economically bad"—not that all Protectionists are bad, but that the system tends to harden all "into positive selfishness." This is an indictment with which all nations are graciously covered except the British, and the British may stand up and thank God that they "are not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican." The world, however, will be slow to believe that free trade was adopted, or is now upheld, for any other reason than its supposed advantages, not to moral, but to British material and trading, interests. If any nation has exhibited more of purely financial selfishness than embroiders the history of some British administrations, it has not been recorded. This part of the indictment against protection is as gratuitous as it would be to say that not all Free-Traders are liars, but the system tends to harden all into positive falsification. Though we might highly appreciate the good opinion of Mr. Gladstone, he leaves us in no doubt that it cannot be won unless we "frankly adopt and steadily maintain a system of free trade." We must, however, frankly and steadily maintain that the terms are too exorbitant.

In his pathetic exhortation to Americans on the selfishness and moral aspects of the question, urging Protectionists to be good as well as great, Mr. Gladstone forgets that he and his countrymen are not entirely without sin, and may not, therefore, cast the first stone across the Atlantic even to hit Americans. But others have not forgotten that free trade was begotten by greed for the trade of the world, that it was the British war power which forced, and continues to force, the opium trade upon China, by which the Indian government obtains an annual income of near forty million

dollars; that the religion of Great Britain, politically established, may have something too much of perfunctory support through the union of church and state; that its laws of primogeniture were ordained to make the first-born rich and all the rest of the family poor; and that the soil of the United Kingdom is in fewer hands than that of any other country in Europe.

To refute the charge against protection of a tendency to selfishness and lack of morality, American Protectionists may, with more pleasure than is afforded by showing that Free-Traders occupy a glass house, turn the light on all their past history, and offer the evidence of the equality of their laws and citizenship, the uprooting of the inherited laws of primogeniture, the universal education through common schools, the liberal and spontaneous support of Christian churches, the extinction of human slavery originally planted by the mother-country, the free homesteads to the landless, the disbandment of our vast armies at the close of the late war, and their prompt return to the peaceful pursuits of life, the national magnanimity exhibited after victory over rebellion, the payment of our public debt even before it is due, the liberal pensions to those who have suffered in patriotic service (perhaps annually exceeding for like services all British appropriations for the last century), the higher dignity and respect accorded to women, the paternal care of the poor, as well as of the insane, the blind, and deaf-mutes, and the general absence of all beggars.

We appeal finally from Mr. Gladstone to Mr. James Bryce, the author of "*The American Commonwealth*," whose work has already placed him in the rank of Gibbon, Motley, and de Tocqueville. Unlike Mr. Gladstone,—except that he is also a member of the British Parliament,—he is not a partisan, and has devoted years to the study of the United States and its people, visiting every State of the Union for the sole purpose of impartiality and historic veracity. That Mr. Bryce is competent authority on questions of the morals and selfishness of Americans, none will dispute. Setting forth American characteristics, he says :

"They are a moral and well-conducted people."

"The average of temperance, chastity, truthfulness, and general probity is somewhat higher than in any of the great nations of Europe."

"Nowhere are so many philanthropic and reformatory agencies at work." (Volume II., pages 247 and 248.)

"In works of active beneficence no country has surpassed, perhaps none has equalled, the United States." (Page 579.)

Mr. Bryce concludes his great work in the following pregnant words :

“ America has still a long vista of years stretching before her in which she will enjoy conditions more auspicious than England can count upon. And that America marks the highest level, not only of material well-being, but of intelligence and happiness, which the race has yet attained, will be the judgment of those who look not at the favored few for whose benefit the world seems hitherto to have framed its institutions, but at the whole body of the people.”

JUSTIN S. MORRILL.